

Contents

Page

386	ALL GO	<i>The Editor</i>
388	AN AMERICAN VIEW OF VIETNAM — 2	<i>Edward Duff, S.J.</i>
395	CONSISTENT COMMUNISTS	<i>H. W. Henderson</i>
400	MRS. MARKHAM ON THEOLOGY	<i>J. H. Crehan, S.J.</i>
405	REQUIEM FOR A REVIEW	<i>The Editor</i>
414	MOTHER INDIA JOINS SPACE LEAGUE	<i>E. L. Way</i>
419	DYNAMIC UNITY	<i>Francis Fenn, S.J.</i>
424	AS YOU WERE BUDGET	<i>J. M. Jackson</i>
431	HOW NOT TO SHOOT CROCODILES	<i>Czeslaw Jesman</i>
436	ANY QUESTIONS ?	<i>William Lawson, S.J.</i>
441	BOOK REVIEWS	
446	QUIET ENGLISHMAN	<i>Paul Crane, S.J.</i>

If You Change Your Address:
Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane S J

VOLUME 11

JULY 1970

NUMBER 7

All Go

THE EDITOR

BY the time these lines are published this country could have a new government. It will be time then for the confidence trick to begin all over again, irrespective of whether Harold Wilson continues in No. 10 Downing Street or the place is taken over by Edward Heath. What I mean is this.

Almost the first act of the new government will be to indicate, as Mr. Wilson did six years ago and the Conservatives when they took over after the fall of Mr. Attlee's second post-war Administration, that this country is in a condition of grave and growing financial crisis. There will follow the usual mini- (or crisis) budget accompanied by the usual ritualistic measures — slashing of the travel allowance, curtailment of imports, export-or-die notices and the heaving up of bank rate. Harold Wilson did this in 1964 because the Tories had left him with an economy inflated to the point where the balance of payments was increasingly adverse. To avoid eventual international bankruptcy, belts had to be tightened and so on. This was approximately six years ago.

Having restored the international balance through hardship measures which made the electorate increasingly dis-

grunted and the powerfully organised amongst them able to give loud voice to their disgruntlement, Mr. Wilson and his colleagues found themselves out in the political cold. A year ago, their chances of continuing in office appeared increasingly slim. The only way to brighten them was to dish out more spending money to the electorate. The way chosen was to yield to the pressure of mounting wage demands. This became possible early this year when the balance-of-payments position improved as a result of the austerity measures of previous years. The electorate could now be given its lolly and the inflation allowed to run wild provided it did not run to the point where the favourable balance was destroyed and international bankruptcy incurred before election day. It was considered possible to do this. Having had the "stop", we could now have the "go". If Harold Wilson was to return to Downing Street, it would be on an inflationary spiral from which he would proceed to rescue the country after the polling was done.

During past months the present Government has bowed to a storm of wage demands, thus fostering amongst the people an illusion of prosperity, which is thought of cynically — and, in all probability, accurately — as an election winner. Now it is all "go". With the election safely won, the next Labour Government (or its Conservative successor) will have to impose some years of "stop" before returning once more to a policy of "go" as a probable election winner.

This is the way things have gone since the war and, in all probability, will continue to go. Henry VII was as bad with his lustful clipping of the coinage. In fact, there was a certain honesty about his roguery, which one is compelled almost to admire. After all, he was not ashamed to let it be known that he was out for himself. His greedy opportunism was not cloaked in high-sounding phrases. What sickens me nowadays is the thought that, from whoever wins the next election we are going to get the usual high-sounding phrases about the national good used to cloak what is, in fact, no more than a party-political manoeuvre.

In this, the second of two articles, Father Edward Duff examines the consequences of American withdrawal from Vietnam as they will affect the domestic problems of the United States and her standing in Asia. Finally, as they will affect the 900,000 Catholics in South Vietnam who fled there from the North.

An American View of Vietnam

2: Consequences Of Withdrawal

EDWARD DUFF, S.J.

THE consequences, both short and long range, of the American withdrawal from Vietnam will be multiple and possibly massive, even if (as is the case of all futuribles) they are uncertain.

The First Lost War

(1) For the first time the United States has lost a war. Accepting defeat with grace is not part of the American ethos; it is not prized as the proper comportment of the gentleman; it has no home in the American temperament nor, indeed, in the American experience. During the primary campaigns for the nomination of the Democratic Party in the late spring of 1968, it was suggested to the late Senator Robert Kennedy that an arrangement should be worked out with Senator Eugene McCarthy whereby they would divide up the States where they would seek delegates to the national convention, since both were opposed to the policies of President Johnson. The Kennedy refusal was immediate and

brutal: "My father taught us to play to win"! A remark of Leo Durocher, the veteran manager of several baseball clubs, has passed into the popular idiom: "Nice guys finish last"!, i.e. in the standing of the teams in the League at the end of the season.

In a fashion still obscure — because the reality has not yet been assimilated — the American people will be forced to admit defeat by a fourth-rate military Power. An initial blow to their pride was the official apology to North Korea, in order to obtain the release of the captured crew of the spy-ship Pueblo. The humiliation was accepted as the cost of living in a world of successful bandits, much as a parent agrees to pay a ransom for the recovery of his kidnapped child. Grumbles that a nation, which can put men on the moon, cannot master a mob of stunted Asians in black pyjamas who cannot fly an aeroplane, can be expected.

Will the military failure in Vietnam, however disguised, disrupt the "domestic tranquility" of the United States, one of the purposes according to the Constitution, for the formation of the federal government? In his TV appearance following the news of his election, Mr. Nixon recalled an incident during a short stop at a small town in the course of the campaign. A girl held up a poster reading "Bring Us Together"! That would be the goal of his administration, the successful candidate promised. So far the President has been largely successful. The "silent majority" he speaks of is not a fiction; it expressed itself as late as December 2nd, in the House of Representatives by a vote of 333 to 55 approving a resolution affirming support for the President's efforts "to negotiate a just peace".

What then, of the huge Mobilisation-for-Peace marches in Washington and demonstrations in a few other cities? Undoubtedly, the vast majority of young people, whose memories do not include the threats and tensions of the Cold War, oppose almost unanimously a military effort that menaces their lives and, in any case, interferes with their plans. But the importance of a mass of young people should not be exaggerated. Last August, nearly 500,000 of them

descended like locusts in the rain on a farm at Woodstock, in upstate New York, for a week-end, ostensibly to hear a succession of jazz celebrities. Peaceful as the Mobilisation marchers, the jazz devotees were more than double their number. More serious is the alienation of a very large number of educators, editorialists, the clergy and intellectuals in general; these see in the Vietnam war a brutal and irresponsible exercise of American strength. The title of Senator Fullbright's book, *The Arrogance of Power*, is indicative of this mood.

Possible Worsening of U.S. Race Relations

(2) One of the more disturbing prospects is the possible deterioration of race relations in the United States. By the working of the military draft system, which allowed deferments for those in higher studies and for those in posts essential to the national interest, a larger number of negroes (say 10 per cent) are in uniform than their proportion in the general population would dictate. Moreover, given the unemployment rate among negroes and, commonly, their lack of skills, very many of them volunteered for service. (For the same reason many re-enlist and make the Army a career.) These soldiers became accustomed to use arms freely and, presumably, on civilians as well, since it is the particular tragedy of a guerrilla war that it is often impossible to tell who is friend and who is foe. Will such an experience provide recruits for nihilist movements such as the "Black Panthers", for whom an arsenal is a substitute for an argument? Or, on the contrary, will the experience of military discipline, supply a cadre of negro men capable of assuming responsibility as policemen and school teachers? Such an outcome would be a great boon, for it is part of the sorry and sordid heritage of slavery — and of recent welfare laws — that the negro family is characteristically matriarchal; that the growing child frequently lacks the presence of a strong and steady father.

The influence of the war on the racial attitudes of the white soldier has been largely negative. Although there are reports of comradeship at arms, discovered in the terror of

battle, between troops of different colour, and while all U.S. regiments are racially integrated, the American white soldier has learned a large contempt for his supposed allies, the South Vietnamese, whom he deems cowardly and corrupt. (For the North Vietnamese enemy, on the other hand, there is a grudging respect.) While the all-pervasive U.S. presence was dominating and destroying the countryside and culture of the country, the average GI felt himself exploited by the South Vietnamese. The assumption of racial superiority vis-a-vis the Vietnamese took the familiar form of the epithet "gooks". Once again, colour, an accident of genes, shaped attitudes whose lasting effect is impossible to predict.

Loss of Prestige for the Military

(3) A spectacular loss of prestige for the military leadership is not only likely, it has already occurred. Not a single general has emerged with any popular appeal because, despite continuing promises of success provided more reinforcements were supplied, there have been no victories to celebrate. The handsome General William C. Westmoreland, now Army Chief of Staff, receives ample invitations to address industrial groups but he is, after all, the American General Gamelin; his reputation — as is his image — is about that of the national chief of the Boy Scouts.

The military remain persuaded, however, that the war could have been won, except for the restraints imposed by civilian authorities. Thus, in recent testimony before a Congressional committee, released as late as December 1st, 1969 General Westmoreland answered the question whether victory was still possible in Vietnam. "Absolutely," he replied, "if it were the policy of this country to seek one and if we were given the resources . . . It is my opinion that, if we had continued to bomb, the war would be over at this time — or would nearly be over".

Will, then, the military exploit the future feeling of dismay over the country's first defeat in war and the loss of 40,000 dead G.I.s by assertions of having been "stabbed in the back" on the home front? It is most improbable. There

is no precedent in American history of the military refusing to accept civilian authority. Even the vain-glorious General Douglas McArthur, the undisputed hero of the war against Japan, submitted when summarily recalled by President Truman during the Korean war. While for a short time McArthur successfully exploited a large measure of personal sympathy, he never attracted political support.

The War and the Economy

(4) But if the prestige of the military has declined, it is not so sure that its hold on the economy can be so easily disengaged. In his farewell speech to the nation President Eisenhower warned against the threat of what he called "the military-industrial complex". Today one would have to add an additional factor to those two elements — the trade unions who also have a stake in the making of goods for the military. If one adds to the members of the armed forces and its 1.3 million civilian employees, the 3.8 million on the payrolls of 100,000 firms engaged in defence production (plus their dependents), almost one-fifth of the nation depends on the military establishment for its livelihood. The convergence of interests is revealed in the figure of 12,000 retired officers of high rank now employed by firms with government contracts. The investments — and presumably the profits — involved are enormous. During World War II a humorous cartoon appeared in the *New Yorker* to illustrate the financial irresponsibility of the military; it pictured a group of naval officers around a conference table, one of them asking "Could you be more precise, Admiral, would you say \$1 billion or \$2 billion?" Today such extravagance in estimating costs is commonplace. An official report of the Pentagon to the Senate Armed Services Committee, released on December 1st, acknowledged that major weapons programmes are costing \$20 billion — or 27 per cent — more than the Defence Department originally indicated to Congress. The cost of the Minuteman II missile alone has risen by \$3.7 billion, that of the C-5A transport plane by \$1.6 billion.

Is the American economy so tied, then, to the production

of military equipment that it cannot free itself without a major crisis? The monthly newsletter of the prestigious First City Bank of New York does not think so. Indeed, there is such a list of projects of prime importance — the rebuilding of the cities, the alleviation of poverty, the protection of the environment (not to speak of aid to the Third World), all neglected because of the emphasis on the military effort — that the economy could be kept humming indefinitely and full employment assured. As in so many other matters, the question is one of political will.

Withdrawal and U.S. Foreign Policy

(5) The effect of the projected withdrawal from Vietnam on American foreign policy could take several directions, the most obvious — but not at all the most certain — being the recrudescence of isolationism. What can be expected is the more emphatic assertion of Congress *vis-a-vis* the Executive, since the Vietnam policy was determined almost exclusively by a succession of Presidents. While the federal Constitution makes the President the Commander-in-chief of the armed forces, it empowers Congress alone to declare war and declares that all treaties are ratified by the “advice and consent” of the Senate, a fact President Wilson forgot to his later cost at Versailles. In more recent years, American commitments abroad have grown through Executive Orders — decrees, in effect — issued by the President. Thus, Franklin Roosevelt transferred by Executive Order 50 overage destroyers to England in exchange for bases in the Caribbean while the United States was officially neutral. It was when Under Secretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in an open hearing that, for all practical purposes, the President has the power on his own initiative to engage the country in war, that Senator Eugene McCarthy strode from the room, exclaiming: “This is intolerable. This issue must be taken to the people”. It was this that provoked the McCarthy campaign to defeat Johnson for the Democratic nomination.

There is, then, at present, in the United States, a large repugnance at what is termed “pactomania”, a policy

commonly identified with John Foster Dulles, whereby the United States promised to defend militarily almost anyone who cared to be defended. There is an embarrassment at the role of "the world's policeman", a role said to be sought by the United States. As a result, half of the 3.5 million Americans in uniform are stationed at 429 "major" and 2972 "minor" military installations, covering 4,000 square miles, in 30 countries, Hawaii and Alaska. There is a new modesty about American power, a new recognition of the limits of our national strength, a new desire to restrict commitments to other nations, a new political realism.

Conclusion: the Refugees

The chief consequence of the war in Vietnam is that there will never be another Vietnam-type war, another American military involvement where American interests are not paramount. What that means for the future of Southeast Asia, for the security of Laos, Cambodia and Malaysia, history will recount. What it means for the checking of wars of national liberation can only rejoice the hearts of Generals Lin Piao and Giap whose methods have proved superior to the counter-insurgency tactics of the Green Berets whose great patron was John F. Kennedy. What it means for the pledged word of the United States, given so widely and perhaps too carelessly, to defend all allies, is for other nations to determine. What it means for those in South Vietnam who have opposed the Hanoi régime — not least the 900,000 Catholic refugees from the North — is too horrible to contemplate.

Consistent Communists

H. W. HENDERSON

WHY, it is sometimes asked, are the Communists so inconsistent in their policies? This is a question that can only be asked by those who do not understand Communist tactics. The fact is that Communists in the Western World are not in the least inconsistent. They are, in fact, fanatically *consistent* in their behaviour.

In the West they campaign for disarmament.

But they make no protest against the massive armaments of Russia.

In the West they defend the policy of self-determination.

But they support Russia's oppression of the Satellite States.

In the West they uphold the right to strike, and pose as the foremost champions of free trade unions.

But they make no protest against the suppression of strikes in Russia and the denial of all trade-union freedom there.

In the West they continually demand higher wages. But they refrain from criticism of the pitiful wages paid to Russian workers.

In the West they seek the extension of every democratic right (freedom of speech, press and election). But they make no protest against the denial of these rights in the Soviet Union.

In the West they pose as the strongest opponents of war.

But they meekly tolerate Soviet armed aggression against other States, and the doctrine of "wars of liberation", which is used to justify it.

In the West they defend every "victim of oppression". But they make no protest against the countless victims of oppression in the Soviet Union.

In the West they oppose "colonialism" in any form. But they are silent in face of the Soviet plundering of Satellite States, which has now become notorious.

In the West they uphold the doctrine of non-interference in the affairs of other States.

But they make no protest against Soviet interference in the affairs of every democratic country: a policy in which they have always been the willing tools of Soviet imperialism.

In the West they continually denounce the existence of social inequality — a principle argument for the "class war".

But they refrain from criticism of the wealth of the new ruling class of Soviet bureaucrats who enjoy every luxury denied to the working class.

In the West they denounce any suggestion of conscription.

But they make no protest against the existence of conscription in the Soviet Union, whose leaders boast of having the most powerful military machine in the world.

In the West they denounce the possession of nuclear weapons and repeatedly stress the terrible destruction these could cause.

But they blandly tolerate the massive nuclear arms possessed by Soviet Russia.

In the West they uphold the right to street marches and protest demonstrations against government policies. But they make no protest against the suppression of these in Russia despite the fact that, like many other non-existent Russian liberties, the right to street marches and demonstrations is "guaranteed" by the Soviet Constitution.

In the West they continually demand an end to the cold war.

But they never criticise the vicious slander directed by the Soviet Press against the democratic world;

slanders which are daily repeated in their own hate-filled party publications.

In the West they support the cause of any nationalist movement.

But they pretend not to know that, in the Communist Empire, nationalism in any form is continually denounced.

In the West they demand the boycotting of "non-democratic" States.

But they make no protest against Russia entering into alliance with any country she wishes to. (They even supported and defended the Russo-German Alliance of 1939-'41 and the supplying of oil to Italy during the Abyssian War.)

In the West they demand the complete withdrawal of British and American forces from other countries, even when they are there by invitation.

But they uphold the "right" of Russia to have forces in the Satellite States, which are anxious only to get rid of them.

How can these contrasting policies be shown to be consistent? Only through understanding of the fact that Communist policy in every western country is to weaken the West and welcome and assist the growth of Soviet Power. The question of justice, as such, does not concern Communism. It is used only for propaganda purposes. Communists believe and have taught ever since the days of Marx (the doctrine is repeatedly stressed by Lenin) that Socialism can only be obtained through force and violence; which is war. Hence their desire to make Russia stronger and every western country weaker, in preparation for an armed struggle, which Lenin regarded as inevitable. In the industrial sphere they strive to cripple industry by strikes and other means, knowing as they do that the defensive strength of a country is — as Ernest Bevin said — directly related to its industrial power. A wealthy country can afford to be defensively strong, a poor country cannot.

In addition, Western Communists know that industrial

chaos will lead to unemployment, make men desperate and generate the will to revolution. All of which will strengthen the Communist Movement, which impudently pretends to have a remedy for all industrial ills.

The Communists in the West, therefore, are *not* inconsistent. They are not ignorant of the long-term aims of the Soviet Government or of the part assigned to themselves in the Soviet drive for world revolution. Let us look for a moment at the testimony of Igor Gousenko, cipher-clerk to the Soviet Military Attaché in Ottawa, when he defected to the West in September, 1945, and handed to the Canadian Authorities massive evidence of the activities of a Soviet spy ring in Canada. A few weeks after his defection Gousenko testified to the Canadian Authorities that, on coming to Canada, he had been astonished to discover the prosperity and freedom in which Canadians lived, in contrast to the poverty and oppression of the Russian people. He then went on to say:

"Holding forth at international conferences with voluble statements about peace and security, the Soviet Government is secretly preparing for the third world war. To meet this war, the Soviet Government is creating, in democratic countries, including Canada, a fifth column, in the organization of which even representatives of the Soviet Government take part.

"The Soviet leaders have never relinquished the idea of establishing a Communist dictatorship throughout the world . . . Taking into account least of all that this adventurous idea will cost millions of Russian lives, the Communists are engendering hatred in the Russian people towards everything foreign.

"To many of the Soviet people here abroad, it is clear that the Communist Party in democratic countries has changed from a political party into an agency net of the Soviet Government, into a fifth column in those countries to meet a war, into an instrument in the hands of the Soviet Government for creating artificial unrest and provocation.

"Through numerous party agitators the Soviet Government stirs up the Russian people in every possible way against the people of the democratic countries, preparing the ground for the third world war . . .

"I am glad I found strength within myself . . . to warn Canada and the other democratic countries of the danger that hangs over them."

The people of Britain should heed Gousenko's words today, particularly those engaged in industry, where the Communists can do the greatest damage to a nation's economy. They should resolutely oppose the election of a Communist to a position of authority in the trade union movement and support the return of men who, while firmly defending the legitimate interests of the workers, will refuse to act as the servile tools of Soviet imperialism. Lenin said that every work-shop should become a Communist fortress. It is the primary duty of every worker who believes in justice, truth and freedom to see that it does not.

PASSION AND PREJUDICE

Defoe says that there were a hundred thousand stout country-fellows in his time ready to fight to the death against popery, without knowing whether popery was a man or a horse.

William Hazlitt

Mrs. Markham educated generations of Victorians in the history of England by means of a series of discourses to an unusually stupid niece and nephew, Mary and George. Her services have now been secured by the Editor to expound some of the problems which are troubling the modern theologian. From her present abode she is no doubt well placed for carrying out this purpose. Her words of wisdom will appear in Christian Order from time to time.

Mrs. Markham On Theology

J. H. CREHAN, S.J.

MRS. M: You two had better begin with what started all our theology (and nearly brought it to a sudden end), I mean the fact of Original Sin. There are some people to-day, and I dare say you, Mary, have heard their views at school, though George will not have, since men are more conservative. These people say that no one began it, but that none the less there is evil in the world for which we all in some way bear the responsibility, though none of us has done it. The primary phenomenon is said to be the present feeling of deficiency or disorder and of the universal sinfulness of mankind. But neither of you will be misled by such talk into thinking that this is an explanation of the origin of evil; it simply states the brute fact to which our Faith offers some kind of explanation, however mysterious it may appear.

Mary: Sister Angelique at school has told us all about that. She said that after the war the Germans began talking

about their collective responsibility for Hitler. They had voted for him with immense majorities, but casting a vote is such a small act that no single one of them could be saddled with the responsibility for what Hitler did, yet none the less they all felt somehow guilty. We asked her if the French felt the same about their surrender in 1940, and she blushed violently and told us to go on with our work.

Mrs. M: You should not behave like that to your teacher, my girl. She no doubt means well, but these French and German theologians have carried her a little out of her depth when they applied the same idea to the sin of mankind. Original Sin is not the sum of personal sins committed by individuals, but to call it the sin of mankind as a community supposes that mankind is all on the stage at the same time and acts with some corporate feeling but in a sinful way. That will not do as an explanation, nor will it provide the Church with a reason for baptising a newly-arrived baby as she has always done.

George: When our master does not know who drew the cartoon of him on the blackboard before class, he punishes the whole class. Sometimes the drawing has been done by a boy from another class, and we think our master is very unfair. You do not mean, Aunty, do you, that God hands out to us a collective punishment for what we have not done?

Mrs. M: I am glad to see, George, that you see a difference between punishing the Germans for what Hitler did and the problem of the sinful state of the world. Would you say, George, that Hitler was wicked after the Germans voted for him, or before?

George: He might have been worse after, but I think he must have been bad before.

Mrs. M: Exactly. Evil must come from a will that is turned against God. One cannot pretend that evil is somehow present all the time, before there is anyone to turn his will against God. That would land you in the great heresy of the Manichees. I could tell you tales about them, but they are not fit for your young ears. If other people aid and abet an evil man, this no doubt makes him worse. But this greater evil is

the result of their helping him; it is not the precondition of the whole affair. One cannot solve the problem of Original Sin by saying that we all allowed it to happen. That would not answer the question: Who began it? For many centuries after the heresy of the Manichees the Church required every bishop at his consecration to take an oath that he accepted a personal origin for the evil in the world. One has simply turned the problem upside down when one says that no one began it, but that we are all involved in it. One must say that another will, apart from that of God, has had a part in the development of His work and that there is an intractable quarrel or a long-lasting alienation between God and man. You cannot smuggle evil into the system by dividing it up into very small packets which you distribute to a host of individuals to carry; that will deceive no one. When you learned your catechism you may recall a phrase about being prone to evil from your very childhood. This did not mean that the general sinfulness of the world (i.e. the fact that other people committed sins) was being extended to yourself also. Loose talk about general sinfulness is simply a cover-up for poverty of thought.

George: But what is the authority of things put in the catechism?

Mrs. M: You must not look upon the authority of the Church as if it were a kind of boneless wonder. There are, I fear, some to-day who write as if it was so. I have read, for instance, an American author who regards the Church as being something like that. He wrote, it is true, before the Pope's famous encyclical, and said: "The Church has a prodigious ability to blunder in and out of the most surprising errors yet survive with authority". He went on to infer that the teaching of the Church on birth control would be reversed and former positions abandoned. He sent his book to be printed before the encyclical, but it appeared some months after that encyclical, a work which you at your age ought to have read by now. This American compared the Church teaching on birth control with past ideas on the temporal power of the popes. "The birth control issue

has probably already been settled in similar peremptory fashion, and the Church authority will survive even in its humiliation". You both know, of course, from what happened in 1968, that there was no reversal of Church teaching, peremptory or otherwise. What this American wrote early in 1968 looked very foolish when it came out in 1969.

Mary: But Sister Angelique told us that we are the Church. She said that in days long ago the people began adding in the Creed the words which say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father. After a long time this became the Faith of the Church, although a large part of the Church refused to accept it at first.

Mrs. M: What are the nuns coming to? I fear your teacher has but a very inadequate idea of the history of doctrine. When Sister Angelique comes to die, I hope she will meet Pope Damasus, whose Roman synod in AD 382 declared; "The Holy Spirit is not simply the Spirit of the Father, nor yet the Spirit of the Son alone, but the Spirit of both Father and Son". You must not think that the Synod sent out into the streets to find out what doctrine they should proclaim.

Mary: In my history lessons I have been told that the Reformation was a popular movement to restrain the extravagances of the priests. Even some priests agree with this. One of them said recently: "Theologians are beginning to recognise that much of the Reformers' protest against the 'blasphemous fables and superstitious deceits' of contemporary Catholic teaching was motivated primarily by a wish to emphasise the unique character of the sacrifice of Calvary, the supreme value of which they thought was in danger of being undermined by certain extravagant ideas about the Mass".

Mrs. M: I will read to you what Cranmer himself wrote at that time: "The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like topping and lopping of a tree, or cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground; but the very body of the tree,

or rather the roots of the weeds is the popish doctrine of transubstantiation and of the real presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar, as they call it, and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead". When Cranmer wrote this in 1550, he was voicing the spirit of the Reformation, and you can both see that his primary attack is on the real presence of Christ on the altar, a presence which I hope you both hold in reverence. Cranmer was not isolated. Even among the men of the Oxford movement, Pusey in Tract 81 called transubstantiation the root of all evil in Roman eucharistic theology, while in Tract 71 Newman rejected it as not being in accord with antiquity. You see now that not everyone who writes on these theological subjects should be accepted without scrutiny. I have more examples of this kind of thing, but here, I see, our tea is being brought in and I must leave them for another time.

AN EARLY PERSONNEL OFFICER

In 1799 General Tamax received a proposal from Napoleon, who wanted to enter the Russian service, but they were unable to agree, as Napoleon demanded the rank of major.

Tolstoi

CURRENT COMMENT

Father Crane finds distasteful, to put it mildly, the reference of a writer in the last issue of the English edition of "Herder Correspondence" to what is described as "the Pope's . . . almost neurotic insistence on the prerogatives of his authority as successor of St. Peter".

He finds additional matter for comment in a tribute published by Bishop Butler in the same Review.

Finally, he notes the sad decline, since the Council, of the Catholic Social Movement and finds reason for this in the false ideas of Catholic Progressives with regard to renewal within the Church.

Requiem for a Review

THE EDITOR

IN THE LAST issue published in June, *Herder Correspondence* was unable to refrain from taking one last crack at the Holy Father. Along with other progressive journals it has formed the habit of referring to him as "the Pope", presumably in a subconscious endeavour to set the Vicar of Christ on a level with itself and increase, thereby, his vulnerability. The trick is an old one and much in use today. In this particular case, *Herder Correspondence* referred to "the Pope's . . . almost neurotic insistence on the prerogatives of his authority as the successor of St. Peter".

Unity and Authority

Why neurotic? What is neurotic about someone who insists, for example, on freedom in the face of oppression, on truth when confronted with those who constantly

violate it and so on. Equally, why should *Herder Correspondence* call the Holy Father neurotic when he insists on his God-given right and duty to teach and command in face of those within the Church who think nothing nowadays of calling it in question? Only, I would suggest, because, at base, writers in *Herder Correspondence* have a view of papal authority differing strongly from that which is in the tradition of Christendom. In this last issue, the Review contrasts what it calls "The Pope's commendable and laudable awareness of his unique responsibility for maintaining the Church's unity and identity intact" with the "neurotic insistence on the prerogatives of his authority" already referred to. The contrast is quite out of place. It may exist in the mind of the writer in the last issue of *Herder Correspondence*, but it is not in the traditions of Christendom, which sees papal authority as complementary to the papal task of maintaining the Church's unity and identity intact and in no way contradictory to it. The one, in fact, is unthinkable without the other. Unity in the Church of Christ is meaningless without loyal adherence to the authority of the Vicar of Christ on earth. It is precisely to maintain unity that the Holy Father is insisting these days so vigorously on his supreme authority in face of those — like the writer in the last issue of *Herder Correspondence* — who bring it under constant attack. What he and others appear to me to want is not a Church whose members are united in loyal adherence to the Vicar of Christ, but a union of Churches co-ordinated into a semblance of unity under a "constitutional" Pope.

Hopes Unfulfilled

This mean sort of approach is not untypical of a great deal that has appeared during past years in the English edition of *Herder Correspondence*. Many of us who subscribed to it originally did so because we thought we were going to receive each month something we wanted very badly; an objective presentation of information with regard to what was going on within the Church. This is what the original German edition had provided and this is what

many of us paid our money for. This, however, is what we have not been getting in the English edition of *Herder Correspondence*. The last four years, particularly, have seen a steady deterioration of the English edition to a level of writing that was partisan and meanly progressive. The last thing we came to look for in its pages was what we had hoped originally to find there.

Under these circumstances, I find it extremely difficult to understand how Bishop Butler, in a tribute published in the last issue of *Herder Correspondence*, could speak of the Review as having done "valiant service to the English-speaking Catholic world in the field of the publication of information." With respect to the Bishop, I would suggest that this is just about the last thing it has done.

Aggiornamento at Half-Cock

In the course of his tribute, Bishop Butler notes that the Catholic Church in England suffers from "a narrow insularity of outlook". This would appear to mean that English Catholics know little of what is happening in the Church elsewhere in the world. I think this is probably true and I imagine it applies to Catholics in other countries as well. I am not in the least surprised that this should be the case and I take no umbrage at it at all. With the exception of a very small minority I do not see why the vast majority of Catholics in this country should be expected to be in possession of this kind of knowledge. They have neither the time nor the opportunity to acquire it. I cannot see, therefore, that they should be blamed for its lack. Little good, it seems to me, can come from expecting of people that of which their manner of life makes them manifestly incapable. The average English Catholic — for whom I, personally, have the highest possible regard — leaves his house early in the morning to get to work and returns to it in the early evening, which is often far too early for many. His wife, meanwhile, is at it all day on the family chores. When they meet together in the early evening their children are round them and, rightly, their first concern. There is an evening meal to be eaten and dishes to

be done afterwards and children to be got to bed. Does Bishop Butler really expect husband and wife, against the background of this kind of normal day, to dive into a study of the Church in Latin America or the latest comments of Father Schilleebeeex on the question of mixed marriage? With great respect, I would suggest that it is totally unrealistic to think in these terms. I would add, again with respect, that it is this kind of call made so insistently from high intellectual quarters that has done so much to side-track the task of renewal within the Church and send the *aggiornamento* off at half-cock.

Alienation of the Many

When Bishop Butler thanks *Herder Correspondence* for bringing events in the Church abroad steadily to "our" attention, he has, I am afraid, fallen into the trap of identifying his own particular interests with those of the great majority of Catholics in this country. This, of course, is not the case at all; and we make very little progress with the work of the *aggiornamento* if we summon people in the Church to be up and doing in ways open to a very few, but, in fact, ruled out for the many by the very nature of their daily lives. A great deal of progressive Catholic thinking fails lamentably in this regard. It expects of the Faithful lines of action of which they are manifestly incapable because denied by daily circumstances access to the means necessary to inaugurate them and see them through. What progressive Catholic writers fail to realise is that their message goes only to a very few progressive Catholic readers. Trouble comes when this tiny minority, thinking of itself quite wrongly as representative, advocates without ceasing and in the name of the *aggiornamento*, policies and practices within the Church which are repugnant very understandably to the great majority of the Faithful, who lack the background of understanding necessary to associate themselves with the new measures yet, with a very sure instinct, hold them suspect as remedies for our present discontents precisely because they are, of their very nature, out of reach of the great majority of the

Faithful. As these new policies are put into practice, nevertheless, at the insistence of the progressive few, who profess to understand the needs of the Faithful better than the Faithful themselves, the great mass of Catholics feel themselves, with sadness, increasingly alienated from the Church they love. What comes to dominate their lives is an increasing sense of the inadequacy they are made to feel in face of swingeing progressive change.

Renewal and the Average Catholic

Under these circumstances, it seems to me that the first duty of those who teach and write within the Church today is to get out of their own skins and into those of the vast mass of the Faithful. Renewal must be within the capacity of the average Catholic layman if it is to accomplish anything at all; more strongly, it is *meant* to be within his capacity, for the Church itself is meant for him. Christ never intended it for an intellectual few. "Come to me", he said, "all you who labour and are heavy-burdened and I will refresh you". His way to men's hearts was not through clever, intellectual conversation. It was through everything he was that he came to them in a way the simplest could understand. Renewal within the Church must be through the Faithful in the Church. Its practice must be open to the average Catholic — God bless him — and his family in ways they can understand; not downgraded through lack of discernment into no more than an esoteric plaything for an intellectual few. This way lies division within the Church and disaster. Catholics in this country may know little, indeed, of what goes on in the Church in other lands. In this sense, as Bishop Butler says, their outlook may be called "insular". The thing to note, however, is that the removal of this type of insularity of outlook — in itself and understandably, a hopeless task — is *not* an essential condition of *aggiornamento*; nor was it ever meant to be. What is essential — if I may put it this way — is a non-insularity of outlook of the kind which manifests itself in a loyalty to Peter's successor in Rome that remains unblocked and unaffected by any insular con-

siderations and which can never be compensated for by any of the brands of arid cosmopolitanism in vogue in progressive Catholic circles today. It is the proudest boast of him whom we may call, with respect, the average English Catholic that he has this loyalty and has had it as his dearest possession since the days of the Reformation. It is on this kind of foundation that the beginnings of true *aggiornamento* can be built. There is, in fact, no other.

Renewal through Prayer

Renewal, I would suggest, is not primarily a matter of Catholics knowing more *about* their faith. What it would seem to call for, in the first place, is that they should be more lovingly aware of its significance in their lives. Only then will the light of each shine before men, making those around them aware of the things of God. This is what *aggiornamento* means. And the way to it, the instrument of true renewal, is not understanding in width through increased information, but understanding in depth through intensified prayer. Coresponsibility for the Catholic means, surely, that each shares responsibility with all for the advance on earth of the Kingdom of God. How else can that be except that Christ, through each, is made known to others in the measure that each is united to Christ in prayer? The task before each of us, then, is clear. It is that each should renew his life in Christ as a condition of giving Christ, through himself, to others. This is not easy; but none are excused from it because, with God's grace, it is within the reach of all.

Progressiveness and the Press

Bishop Butler is worried that, with the closing of *Herder Correspondence*, what he calls the progressive wing within the Church will no longer get a hearing. "It cannot be questioned", he writes, "that it is conservatism which is most easily assured of a widespread hearing". I must say, again with respect, that I find the Bishop's statement astonishing. I meet a fair number today who note with regret, for example, the change-over of the *Tablet* from the

high level of Douglas Woodruff's great editorship to its present progressive status. Others would say the same of the *Catholic Herald*, which is a very different paper now from what it used to be in the days of Michael de la Bedoyere. Then, there is *Consilium*, which can hardly be classed as a reactionary journal. In fact, if one wanted to seek out in this country a Catholic journal or weekly steadily expressive of what might be called a conservative point of view, one would be very hard put to do so. Catholic Progressives have little difficulty these days in drawing public attention in the Catholic Press to their point of view. Those who might be dubbed Conservatives have a much more difficult time and the same applies to the means of communication in general. One has the feeling that, in this department of the Church's life at national level, the Progressives are very much in control and that they are singularly unprogressive—by which I mean illiberal—when it comes to tolerating the expression of any view opposed to their own and capable of being dubbed “conservative” or “reactionary”. Bishop Butler need have no fear. So far as the liberal point of view within the Church is concerned, its supporters seem to have made a clean sweep of most of the means of communication within the Church. Things would not be so bad if they were allowed to serve for the expression of some other point of view other than their own. But it is just this that is not allowed. No censorship is so strict as that of the liberal Catholic Press with regard to what it would call the conservative point of view. No one, it would seem, is more illiberal than the liberal Catholic in defence of his liberalism. Let the Church exercise censorship in defence of the Faith and he calls it tyrannical. Let someone send a liberal Catholic editor for publication a point of view opposed to his own and it is dubbed by him as conservative and returned to its author.

This is the state of affairs at the moment within the Church in most countries. It is not Progressives who are searching about for a forum where their point of view can be heard and made known, but the unfortunate Conserva-

tives who appear to be denied a hearing on all sides. I am amazed that Bishop Butler should be unaware of this situation, for it has been painfully plain for a considerable time. Anyway, he need have no fear. So far as I can see, progressive opinion will have no difficulty in voicing its opinion publicly within the Church for a long time to come.

Ignorance of Catholic Social Teaching

One of the most frightening things today is the ignorance amongst Catholics of even the elements of Catholic Social Teaching. There was a time—before the second Vatican Council—when the Catholic Social Guild performed valuable service through its endeavour to create within the Catholic community of this country an awareness, at least, of the relevance of Christian principles to public life. Since the demise of the Guild, awareness has died. As a result, we have, at the present time, a generation of Catholics without any knowledge of Catholic Social Teaching and unable, in consequence, to influence their working environment in any significant way. At a time when such influence is needed most and when its exercise would seem to be particularly in accord with the demands made on the Catholic laity by the true needs of post-conciliar renewal, Catholic laymen themselves are far less well equipped to meet these demands than they were in pre-conciliar days.

Progressives and the Decline of Catholic Social Action

Responsibility for this sad state of affairs must be laid primarily at the door of Progressives within the Church who think of renewal quite wrongly as a process through which Catholics should fit themselves more easily into their secular environment as distinct from standing out the more strongly against it. Hence, the search of the Progressives for points of contact with the secular world and their constant endeavour to blur the edge of differences between Catholic belief and contemporary pagan practice. Their approach to a permissive world is through a permissive Catholicism, where points of difference are muted so that

Catholics the more easily may become involved in the secular crowd and in the end, presumably, accepted by it. Those who resist this permissiveness are classified at once by Catholic Progressives as "ghetto-minded" or "triumphalist". And Progressives are insistent in their writing and speaking that no other course of action is open to contemporary Catholics except that laid down by themselves, which might be described as going the way of the world in order to gain the world.

It takes little reflection to see that this kind of advice is not merely nonsensical but pernicious. Those who follow it do not gain the world. The world gains them, as it has gained in recent years all too many priests and nuns who have thought that by lowering their own standards they could gain easier access to their fellow men.

The Heart goes from Good Men

The constant reiteration of this extraordinary line of advocacy has taken the heart right out of what used to be called Catholic Social Action. Those who used to work so hard at it and with such success have been made to feel that their effort is now not wanted because out of touch with the times; a hindrance to that search for bridges between the Church and the world which, the Progressives tell us, is now to be the order of the day and which can only be blocked by those who stand firmly by Christian principles in the social field or, for that matter, anywhere else. Overnight, as it were, the valiant apostles of yesterday have seen their case go by default. They have faded from the scene, their efforts smothered by empty-headed Progressive advocacy of a bogus involvement. The heart went out of the good men of yesterday as small-minded intellectuals took charge so arrogantly of the post-conciliar scene at popular level, using a captured Catholic Press to make their futile point-of-view more widely known.

The heart is still out of good men. Social action is still at zero point at a time when it is most needed. We shall have to wait awhile until the silliness goes. The signs are, thank God, that it is already on the way out.

That Chicom 1, the Chinese satellite, should force an underdeveloped nation like India to enter the space league is tragic in its absurdity. Politically unstable, with economic recession, massive unemployment, unbuilt bridges, and major land reforms ahead, India, with 25 per cent of its national income already committed to defence, now proposes to cost the making of the bomb and its delivery system.

Mother India Joins Space League

E. L. WAY

CHINA'S satellite, *Chicom 1*, weighing 380 lbs. has not added to the gaiety or sanity of nations. It is a technical achievement which could be matched by other countries, if they were prepared to waste such money. Japan, for example, is twenty or thirty years industrially ahead of China and could easily put up a dozen or more satellites for each one launched by the Chinese. But *Chicom 1* is proof that one more country has entered the space age; and it is certain to increase the trade and prestige of the Chinese amongst the small and underdeveloped countries of the world. It also makes one wonder if there is truth in the Russian accusation that the Chinese are supervising the building of a missile base in Scutari (Albanian Shkoder) with the object of preventing the Soviet Mediterranean fleet from operating in the Adriatic. And was it the Chinese satellite that triggered off the American invasion of Cambodia? Or was President Nixon's decision influenced by the Russian pilots flying operational missions over Egypt? Perhaps we shall know when the complete story is made public.

Indian Reaction

What is certain is that the Chinese satellite has already influenced the attitudes of some of the 25-nation Committee on Disarmament which has been convened in Geneva since 17 February. India so far has not signed the non-proliferation treaty. And on 28 April announced that it intends to speed up its own space programme. The Defence Minister, Swaran Singh told Parliament in Delhi that the first Indian satellite could be launched, under existing plans, within five years; but with the success of *Chicom 1* their programme would have to be reviewed. And so the government has ordered estimates to be made to see how much the bomb and its delivery system would cost. (The Indians have all along refused to shelter under the nuclear umbrellas proffered to them by the obliging Americans and Russians.)

A Paradigm

The spectacle of Mother India raising delicately her sari half an inch in order to mince into the space age would be enough to raise a smile in hell were the residents of that place not hardened to human lunacy. For India is beset by the problems of an underdeveloped continent: political instability, massive unemployment, economic recession, land reform, an exploding population, an almost total dependence upon erratic monsoons, and human misery on a scale not experienced in the west for centuries. But let us begin the catalogue with Goa.

Bridge over the River Mandavi

Jawaharal Nehru ordered Indian troops into Goa on 19 December 1961. The reason stated for the conquest — the Indian Supreme Court has ruled that Goa was a “conquest” — was that smuggling operations of gold, liquor, watches, radios, British cloth and other scarce consumer goods, which the Portuguese refused to stop, were a serious threat to the Indian economy. Swiftly New Delhi began to ‘plan’ a new economy for Goa to replace the extremely profitable smuggling it had lost. And, as communications were bad, a

bridge was to be built over the river Mandavi which would connect the mainland with the capital of Goa. The bridge was begun in 1963 amidst public interest and acclaim. Seven years later it is there for all to see — unfinished.

Another scheme was to develop Mormugao Bay, which is one of the finest in India. Through it pass annually millions of tons of iron ore on the way to Japan to earn the foreign exchange so urgently needed by India. But the prices of Goan ore are largely dependent on freight charges, and these are high because the port facilities are inadequate. The scheme to improve these port facilities has been mislaid on someone's drawing board. If the port were modernised another scheme to build a naval base at Mormugao bay might progress beyond the discussion stage. Another plan to build a steel mill in Goa ended when New Delhi decided to build one in Mysore instead. A fertiliser project costing \$60 million ended more happily; after years of indecision final approval for the go ahead was given. But many other plans have been delayed by indifference, red tape, or the brutal fact that New Delhi has no money. But all the same Mother India is costing the making and the delivery system of the bomb, and wishes to send up a satellite to add to the number already there.

Unemployment and Misery

The officially unemployed in India are said to number between ten and twenty million. No one knows the exact figure. It is believed that there are 40,000 engineers out of work; and many graduates end up driving buses, waiting at table in expensive hotels or by becoming clerks. They would surely be material for the communist party. In Calcutta some 600,000 people sleep in the streets, while in Bombay 77,000 live under stairways, on landings or in cattle sheds. (In London in 1904 there were about 1,700 adults and 50 children sleeping in the streets compared with 129 adults on one raw November night in 1963.) And while Calcutta keeps overflowing with human flotsam with little hope of being relieved by new towns, Chandigarh was built at great trouble and expense in the pleasant foothills of the Himalayas.

(Utilities and services are too costly in new towns for many underdeveloped countries. Mohone a town built by the National Rayon Corporation is an example of such prohibitive costs.)

Recession

In ten years India has had a border clash forced on her by China, a war over Kashmir with Pakistan and two years of poor monsoons. Food is so scarce that famine is seldom far off. In any case so many villages have two-acre farms where under the best conditions the existing population barely survives. Poor planning by the government and an emphasis on industrialisation rather than agriculture has led to a recession. Nationalised plants have been the hardest hit and are making grievous losses being incapable of selling their products because few have money to buy. West Bengal, not surprisingly, has been crippled by strikes which, as usual, have been blamed on the communists. No doubt they have exploited the human misery. Student riots in India, as elsewhere, are on the increase. A graduate without a job is a potential revolutionary. He has enough education to see that in the twentieth century no one need be jobless or hungry; and that a system that makes such things not only possible but permanent must be swept away. John Kenneth Galbraith's statement that "Talk of revolution is one way of avoiding reality" might make sense to the student if he were secure for life in an academic job. But waiting at tables might dim even the brilliant professor's sense of reality. Indians have tried Communism in West Bengal and Kerala; but the Communists were too busy fighting other members of Left-wing parties to spend much time on solving the problems of the people who elected them.

Land Reform and Population

After the nationalisation of India's 14 largest banks, Mrs. Gandhi has turned her attention to land reform. She will be up against MPs who are landowners, and will also be opposed by others who will put up the two oldest arguments in the political bag of tricks: (i) that there is not enough land

for all the landless peasants in India and (2) that taking land away from the rich farmer and breaking it into fragments will not produce more food but on the contrary is likely to produce a shortage. It is planned next year to produce 100 million tons of foodgrains. This will not feed everybody, but it will reduce the number of the hungry. With drastic land reform, it is argued, this goal will certainly not be achieved.

And every year another 13 million babies are born. At the present birthrate India should have a population of one billion by the end of the century; that is more than the entire world could possibly hope to feed by the present methods of agriculture. And Indian parents having no pensions to look forward to, and no welfare state to depend upon naturally consider their children as the only possible means of support when they are finally worn down by age and exhausted by the lifelong struggle to maintain a standard of life that would be despised by a Stone Age tribe.

Political Instability

The Congress Party was the Party which, among other forces, gained India its independence. But since the death of Nehru it has been divided between the gang run by the old party bosses, known as the Syndicate, and Indira Gandhi's left-of-centre faction. The party dispute is mainly ideological, though here as elsewhere it is also a struggle for personal political power. After its setback in the 1967 election, Mrs. Gandhi tried to turn the party leftwards in a "Socialist spirit of service and sacrifice" but the conservative element in the party's leadership managed to thwart most of Mrs. Gandhi's proposed socialist legislation. (Much the same thing happened to the much milder legislation of President Kennedy when it came up before a Republican dominated senate.) The future does not concern only the future of the Congress, nor the future of Mrs. Gandhi; it concerns the future of India. And in attempting to destroy Mrs. Gandhi the syndicate may not only destroy the Congress party which has ruled India for 23 years, but it may make inevitable the rule of colonels.

What is the basis of Christian unity? Is the Protestant communion service incapable of engendering the life of grace? And are Protestant ministers merely dressed-up laymen? Does the work of Christ in the Church primarily consist of finding people who are already mature and responsible? Fr. Fenn in this article examines these questions with his usual lucidity and wealth of scriptural reference.

Dynamic Unity

Francis Fenn, S.J.

WE saw in our last article that the Church is a mystery, the sign on earth of Christ the redeeming Lord, his earthly body. We cannot separate the outward structure of the Church from its inner reality and meaning.⁽¹⁾ But we discovered that there are degrees of "incorporation" into the Church — put simply, this means that one can be more (or less) a member of it. So Catholics who are unrepentant sinners are not members of the Church in the same sense as those who "possess the Spirit of Christ" — as the Vatican Council puts it. What about those, we asked, who do possess this Spirit and yet are "outside the visible boundaries of the Catholic Church" through no fault of their own?

"We can say that in some real way they are joined with us in the Holy Spirit, for to them also he gives his gifts and graces, and is thereby operative among them with his sanctifying power".⁽²⁾

It is, in fact, the possession of the Spirit of Christ which is the basis of Christian unity: "We have all been

(1) *Constitution on the Church*, art. 8. (2) *ibid.*, art. 15.

baptised in one Spirit to form one body". (3) So all who have been baptised are in some sense members of the one body of Christ which is what the Church is.

"Baptism, therefore, constitutes a sacramental bond of unity linking all who have been reborn by means of it. But baptism, of itself, is only a beginning, a point of departure, for it is wholly directed towards the acquiring of fullness of life in Christ. Baptism is thus oriented toward a complete profession of faith, a complete incorporation into the system of salvation such as Christ himself willed it to be, and finally, toward a complete participation in Eucharistic communion. The communities separated from us lack that fullness of unity which should flow from baptism . . ." (4)

Read that passage again, if you will, stressing the words "fullness" and "complete". The use of the latter word implies that there is such a thing as incomplete participation even in Eucharistic communion; as the decree itself goes on to say:

"When they commemorate the Lord's death and resurrection in the Holy Supper, they profess that it signifies life in communion with Christ and they await his coming in glory".

A Protestant communion service is not just "nothing", nor are Protestant ministers simply dressed-up laymen:

"The brethren divided from us carry out many of the sacred actions of the Christian religion. Undoubtedly . . . these actions can truly engender a life of grace, and can be rightly described as capable of providing access to the community of salvation." (5)

The preaching of the Word, for example, is a true "ministry" arousing and strengthening the faith of those who listen. Anglicans and Protestants usually know the Sacred Scriptures (6) better than we do, and it was a concern

(3) I Corinthians 12, 13. (4) *Decree on Ecumenism*, art. 22.

(5) *ibid.*, art. 3. (6) *ibid.*, art. 21.

of the Vatican Council that our own priests should give more attention to preaching: in the Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests, it occupies the first place among "priestly functions". No doubt a Protestant sermon, though based upon sound knowledge of the Bible, may not at all points agree with Catholic teaching. But we must think of such a ministry in a positive way — of the good it does, rather than of its involuntary defects. The same applies to the pastoral work of these good men: how often have we heard it said, with regard to their ministry to the sick and dying, "What good can they do, without the Last Sacraments?" Only God, of course, can know the answer to that question: but it is lacking in charity, to say the least, to reproach our brothers in Christ for something which cannot possibly be their fault!

It is not easy for us to think of "more and less" where belonging to the Church is concerned: nor must we forget the principle we have laid down, that we must not separate the visible structure of the Church from the spiritual communion of faith — as if a person could belong to one without in some way belonging to the other. "In the Church" and "in Christ Jesus" (7) are the same thing.

But this works both ways. One could think of a "spiritual" Church consisting of all who believe in Christ, without taking account of the visible, perceivable "bonds" and "links" with the Catholic Church of which the Council reminds us. Or, on the other hand, one could have in mind the Barque of Peter, sailing through a sea in which "non-Catholics" (meaning everybody else) were drowning, and from which they must if possible be saved by "conversion" to the Catholic Church. If one (perchance) had the latter picture in mind, it might help to recall that the Church is not a "thing", but is made up of persons and has to do with their union with a Person. What is wrong with the former, "spiritual" vision is not simply a forgetfulness of the fact that persons live on earth, but that they are of their very

(7) Ephesians, 3, 21.

nature "bodily" — which will not always mean the same thing as "fleshly". "You know, surely", St. Paul would tell us, "that your bodies are members making up the body of Christ". (8)

Even within the Catholic Church (apart from good and bad Catholics), there are degrees of belonging. From the point of view of Christ's action in the sacraments, the baptised,

"bound more intimately to the Church by the sacrament of confirmation (9) . . . are through the reception of the Eucharist fully joined to the Body of Christ." (10)

On the side of the recipient, there must be degrees even of this "fully joined" — on account of a greater or lesser faith and love.

We can perhaps sum up the position we are taking in the words of a recent article in the *Clergy Review*:

"Those who by Baptism are incorporated into the family of our heavenly Father can participate to a greater or lesser degree in the family life. This can apply not only to the different type of Christian allegiance, (11) but also to the different stages of the human development of the child. It can also apply to the inadequate religious development of those who, humanly speaking, are adult, but from the religious point of view are still children." (12)

The kind of unity here pictured is not something monolithic, static: it is a living, growing unity brought about by the Holy Spirit, and therefore dynamic in nature. While we have insisted on the Christ-given outward structure of the Church, we must not forget (as the Council itself reminded us) that the earthly is for the sake of eternal life: Popes, bishops and sacraments are necessary means which will one day pass. With this in mind, we may quote from St. Paul's "epistle of unity":

(8) I Corinthians, 6, 15.

(9) *Constitution on the Church*, art. 11. (10) *Decree on the Ministry of Priests*, art. 5.

(11) i.e. "denominational". (12) M. Gwinnell: *The Age for Confirmation*, Jan. 1970.

"We are all to come to unity in our faith and in our knowledge of the Son of God, until we become the perfect Man, fully mature with the fullness of Christ himself. Then we shall not be children any longer . . . If we live by the truth and in love, we shall grow in all ways into Christ . . . So the body grows until it has built itself up, in love." (13)

It has been well said, in commenting on this passage, that "the work of Christ in the Church is not primarily to find people who are already mature and responsible, but to bring men to maturity who through weakness are as children". (14) May we not think of our separated brethren as being lacking in maturity, through no fault of theirs, in a particular way; or should we say, lacking in many of the means which make for maturity, and which we ourselves too often use so badly? "Let all Christ's faithful remember that the more purely they strive to live according to the Gospel, the more they are fostering and even practising Christian unity". (15) While we must always be trying to "build bridges", the chief work of ecumenism is to become better Christians — this applies to ourselves as well as to the "separated Churches".

To be "built up in love" means to be built up in Christ, with the life which he shares with his Father and which is given to us by the Spirit: "I pray that they may all be one; even as thou Father, art in me, and I in thee, so that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (16). We must not lose sight of the apostolic purpose of the unity of Christians in Christ — a unity which, as I have tried to show, can grow in all kinds of ways. We are witnesses to the world of what Christ is.

And so we return to the title of the first article in this series of two. As Pope Paul has said: "The Church is a mystery. It is a reality imbued with the hidden presence of God. It lies, therefore, within the very nature of the Church to be always open to new and greater exploration". (17)

(13) Ephesians 4, 13-16. (14) *Jerome Biblical Commentary*, 56:31. (15) *Decree on Ecumenism*, art. 7.

(16) John 17, 21. (17) Sept. 29, 1963.

What kind of a Budget was it? Do the poorest benefit? Should we consider abolishing the present income tax child allowances and rely instead upon Family Allowances? These questions are answered by Dr. Jackson, who also glances at the automatic increase in the tax burden that accompanies inflation.

As You Were Budget

J. M. JACKSON

THE budget presented by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in April was probably one of the least exciting for many years. There were no massive increases in taxation as in recent years. That at least was unnecessary in view of the improved balance of payments situation. On the other hand, there was little scope for easing the burdens that had been imposed in earlier years. The main concessions were a raising of income tax personal allowances and a concession to those earners who are at the lower end of the surtax scale.

The Chancellor claimed to have made concessions that would give help to those most in need. By raising the personal allowances, some relatively low paid workers were taken out of the income tax system altogether. On the other hand, taxpayers at higher income levels did not reap significant benefit from this change. This was because the reduced rate of tax on the first £260 of taxable income was abolished. This means that anybody with at least £260 of taxable income will now pay the full standard rate of 8s. 3d. in the pound on the first £260 instead of the old reduced rate of 6s. od. This means an extra £29 5s. tax.

So some men with relatively low pay will gain a little from the change the Chancellor has introduced. A man earning about £18 a week¹, and married, is likely to be left

1. This represents rather less than three-quarters of the average earnings of men in industry.

almost exactly as he was before the budget, and this remains true until earnings reach £5,000 and a man benefits from the surtax concession. The surtax concession can be made, of course, because there are so few surtax payers and such a small amount of tax involved that the cost to the Exchequer is not very great. Judged in terms of equity, however, it is hard to see how one can justify tax reliefs to the very poor and to the comparatively rich whilst giving nothing at all to those in between.

Do the Poorest Benefit?

In fact, the budget gave nothing to the really poor. It may be agreed that those people who only just came into the income tax bracket before the change could hardly be called rich. Nevertheless, such people are not the desperately poor. Consider, for example, a man with a wage of £15 a week and a family of five children. Even when Family Allowances are added to his earnings, such a man is not and was not liable to pay income tax. His allowances already exceeded his total income, and raising the personal allowance further does nothing for such a man.

While, therefore, a little help is given to some who are not very well off, the worst off are not helped, and never can be helped by income tax changes. An increase in Family Allowances, on the other hand, would have provided help for those who really were in the greatest need. If it were thought necessary to limit the help to such people, the 'claw-back' could have been resorted to as it was when the allowances were last increased. For example, an increase of 5s. in the Family Allowance would mean another £13 a year for the second and subsequent children in every family. If the tax child allowance were reduced by £32, the taxpayer would pay additional tax amounting to 32 times 8s. 3d., and this is approximately £13. The only objection to this procedure is that a point will be reached sooner or later where it cannot be used again. Thus by the time we raise Family Allowances by 10s. od. above their present level, and have lowered the income tax child allowance by £64, we will then be giving a tax allowance of only £9 in respect of children

for whom Family Allowances are drawn. At this point, the 'clawback' will not be able to operate for any subsequent increases.

Family Allowances or Tax Relief?

It may well be that we should consider abolishing the present income tax child allowances and relying upon Family Allowances instead. Let us look at the position of the standard rate taxpayer. At present, he will receive a Family Allowance of £1 a week for the third and subsequent children, and an income tax allowance of £73. The Family Allowance is taxed as earned income, and is, in fact, worth £35 8s. a year. The tax relief on £73 is worth £30 2s. Thus the standard rate taxpayer benefits to the tune of £65 10s. a year from the combined effect of Family Allowances and income tax child allowance.² Assuming that we are to continue to pay Family Allowances over the Post Office counter to all families with two or more children, it would clearly be a very simple matter to arrange for an increased allowance of 25s. od. a week to be paid instead of £1. This allowance would be tax free, and the administrative complications for the Inland Revenue of adding Family Allowances to the taxpayers earnings in making the assessment, subtracting the child allowance, adjusting this child allowance in those cases where Family Allowances are paid would be avoided.

For the first child, the income tax child allowance is £115, and this will mean a tax saving of nearly £48. To pay the increased allowance of 25s. od. for *every* child would therefore mean some increase in the total outlays of the Exchequer. There are some 12 million children in the country, and if, say, 4 million of these are first or only children, the extra cost would amount to £17 a year for each child (the difference between the proposed 25s. od. Family Allowance and the £48 a year benefit from tax relief at present). This would mean a total of nearly £70 million. This

2. The net benefit for the second child is rather less, the Family Allowance being 18s. a week.

would be a lower limit to the cost to the Exchequer. Where a family does not pay income tax, there may be no assistance given to the family for the first child, and thus the whole 25s. od. a week could represent an extra burden on the Exchequer.³

Changes of this kind might well be a top priority when sufficient money is available to meet the cost. The net gain to those already paying standard rate of tax would be small. Each family with children would gain about £17 a year, the increase in the uniform Family Allowance proposed over the value of the child allowance for the first child. The maximum gain of £65 a year would accrue only to those who are right outside the income tax bracket. Whilst the cost might be considerable, it would be help given to those in greatest need. It could, indeed, be argued that there is really no difficulty in making Family Allowances vary for each child. The allowance might, for example, be something like 18s. or 19s. for the first child, equal to the present value of the tax relief given to the first children of standard rate taxpayers. For subsequent children, it could be the proposed 25s. od. There would still be the extra cost of Family Allowances for first children, especially where families previously gained nothing from the tax relief. On the other hand, these people are probably in real need of help.

There is a strong case, too, for the periodical review of Family Allowances. It is proposed that the new state pension scheme should adjust pensions every two years in the light of the change in average earnings. Why should not this be done for Family Allowances. There has been a reluctance to make adjustments in the light of the falling value of money both in the case of Family Allowances and the income tax child allowance.

3. Although there might be a heavy burden on the Exchequer, some help to the parents of one child at the lower income levels can be justified. The first child may involve heavy expenses. The case for paying the allowance for the first child where there are others is that the money is needed by those with really low incomes, and the help is already given in large measure to families paying income tax.

The Increasing Burden of Taxation

Most people probably heaved a sigh of relief when they found that the Chancellor had reached the end of his budget speech without imposing any additional burdens on them. Such relief, however, was misplaced, for the Chancellor *had* in fact increased the tax burden on the public. At least, he did so in so far as he took no steps to prevent the automatic increase in the tax burden that accompanies inflation. The working of this automatic mechanism for heavier taxation may be studied by taking a tax structure similar to the one prevailing in this country but, for simplicity, with rather different figures.

We may, for example, assume that a man is entitled to a tax free allowance of £400 and that all income above this level is taxed at 6s. od. in the pound or 30 per cent if earned. Thus a man with an income of £1,000 would be required to pay in tax 30 per cent of £600. He will, therefore, pay £180 or 18 per cent of his salary. Some time later — perhaps the next year — prices have risen by 10 per cent. There has been, however, no change in the tax allowances or the rates of tax. So a man earning £1,000 will pay £180 in tax still.

As a result of the rise in prices, however, he now needs £11 to buy goods that could previously have been bought for £10. His £1,000 is worth approximately £910 a year ago. A year ago, a man earning £910 would have paid tax at 6s. od. in the pound on £510, or £153. This is fractionally under 17 per cent of his salary. It may well be that in the second year a man who began by earning £910 will have had a 10 per cent increase in salary to offset the increases in prices. Nevertheless, the tax taken from him will have risen from just under 17 per cent of his salary to 18 per cent. The money left in his pocket after tax will not be sufficient to enable him to buy as much as he did in the first year.

It may seem that whilst this is perfectly true, the effect is not all that serious in practice. After all, the increase in the burden of taxation on a man earning £1,000 in the later year, the equivalent of £910 in the earlier year, is only a little over 1 per cent of his salary. In the case in point,

however, the impact is not all that insignificant. Suppose for example, that prices remained constant, and that the Chancellor wanted to raise taxation to take 18 per cent of the income of a man earning £910. This would mean raising his tax bill from £153 to £164, an increase of £11 on a *taxable income* of £510. This is equivalent to an increase of roughly 5d. in the pound on the rate of tax, an increase few people would regard with equanimity. Moreover, it must be remembered that the tax allowances may remain unchanged for a good many years, and even when altered may still leave their real value well below their original value.

There should be an automatic adjustment of the income tax personal allowances, and the child allowances if these are retained, or of Family Allowances if the proposal to substitute a universal Family Allowance is accepted. This is not necessarily to argue that the tax burden ought not to increase; this is not arguing that government expenditure ought to be cut. These are propositions that many people would want to advance. All that is being argued here, however, is that the allowances ought to be adjusted automatically. If the Chancellor needed more money, he would then have to increase the tax rate. This would have two advantages. First, the Chancellor would have to come clean. He would no longer be able to hide from the unthinking public the fact that he was stinging them a bit harder each year without their realising it. We can hardly regard it as good for democracy that the Chancellor can get away with an effective increase in taxation because people do not realise what is happening to them.

The second argument in favour of an automatic adjustment of the allowances is that inflation increases the tax burden on the lower paid proportionally more than it does on the higher paid. Compare, for example, a man earning £500 and one earning £5,000. The first of these men will pay tax on £100 and the second on £4,600. If prices rise 10 per cent and both get a 10 per cent increase in salary, and the tax free allowance remains at £400, the first man will now pay tax on £150 and the second on £5,100. The

first man's taxable income has been increased by 50 per cent, whereas the second's has increased by only about 12 per cent. The burden of taxation is being shifted towards the lower paid.

It may be true that the recent budget raised personal allowances and lifted a good many people out of range of income tax *for the moment*. Wages and prices will no doubt continue to rise, and some of those who now appear to escape the tax net may be brought back into it by wage increases during the year — and if prices rise sharply without much rise in their real wages. Nevertheless, for many paying standard rate of tax, any benefit from increased personal allowances was offset by the abolition of the reduced rate of tax on the first £260 of taxable income. In other words, people earning, say, £1,000 in 1970/71 will pay the same income tax as people earning the same in 1969/70, although the £1,000 at the later date is worth less. And these people at the lower end of the range of income tax payers are being hit harder than those higher up the income scale, *who are even being given some remission of tax.*

THE CONVENTIONAL ENGLISH

If we tried to say that what governs [the Englishman] is convention, we should have to ask . . . where else would a man inform you, with a sort of proud challenge, that he lived on nuts, or was in correspondence through a medium with Sir Joshua Reynolds, or had been disgustingly housed when last in prison.

Santayana

How Not to Shoot Crocodiles

CZESLAW JESMAN

I have never liked crocodiles. Lizards, yes, crocodiles, no. My distaste for this kind of beast may originate in some remote childhood fright. Through a thickening fog of early memories, I still recall a nursery jingle:

We are off to distant Africa
Where the yellow Nile shimmers
And at the polar bear
An atrocious crocodile grins.

I am no bear, but a rather short-sighted human being and, rank amateur though I am at any kind of shooting or hunting, I went off on a crocodile hunt mainly because I read something on this subject in the enchanting books of Captain Bulatevitch. He was an experienced traveller in Ethiopia in the closing decades of the last century, one of many Russian explorers who visited this part of Africa in those days; and he said that shooting crocodiles there was dead easy. This may have been all very well for Bulatevitch; but, as things turned out, it was not too good for me.

My own, very nearly disastrous, crocodile hunt took place about ten years ago.

Even today, most of the area close to the big lakes of the Ethiopian South-West is sheer, exotic landscape. From Addis Ababa, the capital, these vast expanses of salt and sweet water can be reached now in a matter of hours by a network of excellent roads. There are provisional landing grounds in the area, camping enclosures and well appointed small hotels. The charm of the place has not yet been spoilt; only made accessible. It still abounds in wildlife.

However, when I went to the lakes ten years ago to hunt crocodile, it was a very different story. The area in which

they lay was a real wilderness. Depending on the weather, it took three to seven days to get there, and one had to drive in an overland vehicle with reinforced axles. Maps were theoretical. One had to navigate by instinct. It took days, if not weeks, to prepare an expedition. Everything had to be taken; food, water, tents, sleeping bags, cooking utensils, a reserve of petrol, plates, mugs, forks. Above all, one had to take an Italian.

In this case, I had the good luck to secure the services of a gentleman bearing the distinguished name of Machiavelli. He was in no way related to the late eminent writer of the Italian Renaissance, and it was not his real name in any case. He belonged to the so-called "*insabbiati*", those buried in the sands. The term is used for those Italians who, after the collapse of their armies in East Africa in 1941, remained behind. Why did these ex-soldiers do so? There were several reasons. Some wished to avoid repatriation for personal reasons. Others were bitten by Africa: they could not imagine themselves living once more in their congested homeland after years spent with nothing to catch their eye but the limitless horizons of Africa. In the years immediately following the last war, there were several thousand *Insabbiati* in Ethiopia. Their legal status was delicate. They were a cross, perhaps, between "half-deserters" and "free-lance-settlers". Very wisely the Ethiopian Government turned a blind eye to the legal niceties of their position and allowed them without fuss, to remain where they were. It was a sensible thing to do and brought the country benefits. For the expatriate Italians caused no trouble and they proved invaluable as jacks-of-all-trades. They were possessed of uncanny mechanical gifts. You would find them all over Ethiopia and, in fact, the Horn of Africa, doing every kind of job from repairing bridges to administering penicillin injections; with, sometimes, the same person doing both. Additionally, they were invaluable guides and delightful travelling companions for those who wished to venture into the interior.

Signor Machiavelli was one of these. Like most of his

breed, when, very rarely, there was something he did not know how to do, he would reassure his customers with added vehemence as to his ability to do it. He did not know anything about shooting crocodiles. He assured me, however, that he did. As a result, I very nearly lost my life.

Fifteen years ago, the three big lakes of South-West Ethiopia — Margherita, Ruspoli and Stephanie, to give them their European names — teemed with crocodiles. Some of these beasts — undisturbed by hunters and with plenty to eat — reached mighty physical proportions. They could be seven or eight metres long and proportionally as bulky. From time to time, schemes were produced as to how to turn these monstrous saurians into economic assets. According to the vagaries of fashion, crocodile skins—taken only from the belly of the beast—are commercially valuable; but shooting crocs was then a costly business and local facilities for the preservation of the skins were inadequate. I have lived for a good many years in Ethiopia and its adjacent countries; but I never heard of anyone making a fortune or, even, a livelihood out of crocodile skins. As a result the crocodile population of the subtropical Ethiopian lakes multiplied undisturbed. Only hardy souls or dangerously optimistic amateurs like myself tried to hunt them from time to time for sport.

Machiavelli and I had been travelling for eight or ten days before pitching our tent on the shores of Lake Ruspoli. The morning after we did so, Machiavelli woke me up in a state of great excitement. "We are in luck", he said, "my cousin has a crocodile hunting camp in the vicinity. He was passing by earlier on, while you were asleep. He says that the best hunting grounds are only a couple of kilometres away; a sandy beach with crocodiles sunning themselves there by the hundred. We'll approach from the edge of the lake and you'll have all the shooting you want".

His enthusiasm was contagious and we set off immediately, hoping to be on the spot by approximately eleven o'clock. It would be hot enough for the crocodiles to be asleep then, but not too hot, as would be the case at noon or just after, for them to go slithering into the lake for a

cooler. Our party consisted of five men and two young local girls as guides. These hated the crocodiles like poison, for the man-eaters amongst them had devoured some of their companions. We were armed with infantry rifles and a special explosive ammunition. The approach was not difficult. The air was still and a faint breeze rustled through the towering bullrushes in our direction. Thus, we could neither be seen nor smelt by the crocodiles basking in the sun.

Then we saw them, not more than fifty metres away. Machiavelli jumped up and loosed off with his rifle into the midst of the sleeping animals. I did the same. So did the rest. It all happened in a trice, yet I could swear that I saw our "explosive" bullets bouncing off the bony hide of the crocodiles, causing them no harm beyond the inconvenience of a somewhat rude disturbance of their late-morning nap. In a second the beach was empty. We killed not a single croc. So much for Signor Machiavelli's "explosive" bullets. Someone had taken him for a ride.

At the same moment, something unbelievably awful happened. I was suddenly made aware of a charge, like that of the Light Brigade, behind my back. I half wheeled round to see that our party stood in the path of a pack of crocodiles galloping — yes, *galloping* — towards the lake. In the zoos of Europe and on river banks in the tropics one usually sees crocodiles slithering round on their bellies. We know, of course, that they are extremely nimble in water itself. This time, however, it was something else. The pack I saw at this awful moment had their jaws half-open, tails up in the air and they ran, galloped rather, with incredible speed. They had been asleep on a neighbouring hillock and taken fright at our cannonade. This had terrified them out of their wits and their immediate reaction was to make a bee-line for the safety of the lake. Thus they came at us from behind; not to attack us, but simply because we were between them and the water they wanted so badly.

Somehow, they went through us with a rush to disappear with a mighty splash. They had looked, I suppose, worse than they were. But they looked savage in their fright and,

as they flashed through us, we were paralyzed with fear. After it was over, I realised that I had been nicked by a crocodile's waving tail. My rifle was broken in splinters, its bolt twisted and half my arm paralyzed. My side and arm were turning a beautiful reddish purple. For several weeks afterwards I was multi-coloured.

I nearly hit the irrepressible Machiavelli when he suggested, some days afterwards, that we should go and stalk water buffalo! I had had enough of his hunting trips to last me a life-time.

NO OTHER VALUES

Of course, it is not only to enable the United States to compete in the outside world that the ideal of democratic excellence should be preached and practised. The American people deserve better — and want better — than a paradise of rapidly obsolete usable goods. To deny this is not only to condemn the United States to political defeat in the outside world but to make that world easily open to the conviction that the defeat is deserved . . . The values of the market place are not to be despised, but they are not universally valid. And it is certain that no nation that has no other values can hope to lead or to be secure. That way Carthage went.

D. W. Brogan in *America in the Modern World*

Is the mass unemployment which accompanies automation morally justifiable? What do you think of the student claim to a growing degree of self-government? Is it right to opt out of a corrupt society? It is a fact that coloured immigrants receive the worst housing available. Is this fair?

Any Questions ?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

The technological age is bound to be largely automated. Is the mass unemployment that will follow morally justifiable?

To work is man's nature and destiny. Unless he is active, using his physical, mental and spiritual powers, he makes neither himself nor the things he needs in order to survive. Without work he himself will be a wreck, and the world about him will be in chaos. A mere play-boy is a kind of monster, scorning his duty to work. An unemployed man is a reproach to society which denies him his right to work.

But man's work does not consist solely in a struggle to exist. He is not made for continuous exertion. He needs to relax. He must have leisure. He therefore uses his talents to make a breathing-space for himself, in which he can employ other talents than those by which he makes a living. His ingenuity has been always directed to the making of tools which speed up the production of the necessities of life and so extend his free time. The discovery of fire, the wheel, metals, power from water, steam, electricity and the atom have all brought the attainment of human perfection nearer.

Unfortunately, man has not yet found himself. He does not know, or does not respect, human rights. Work, which should be a blessing, has become a curse. A small class has robbed the masses of their rightful share of leisure, so that

now they scarcely know how to use it. "Production" has become an end in itself, so that machines have to be kept running, and man is forced to run with them — they and not he determine the pace of life. The problems that arise in a technological age will not be solved until man sees both work and play as his co-operation with God in a plan for the universe and a progress to eternity.

What do you think of the student claim to a growing degree of self-government?

I think that students, like everybody else, should mind their own business.

And what is their business? Can one hope for a general agreement that the business of students is to study? They are learners, and they should be primarily engaged in learning. They must acquire knowledge by pursuing it, and they should get on with the chase. All other activities are secondary to their first purpose of judiciously filling the empty spaces in their minds.

Students who have some main object in life other than study are not genuinely students and should not be counted or supported as students. The men who run the boilermakers' union are not boilermakers: they are trade union officials. They receive officials' salaries and not boilermakers' wages. If some so-called students are making a career as union officials, then they should have the status of union officials and be paid by their union. Moreover, the members of the union should not delude themselves that they govern themselves, any more than do the members of trade unions.

What students should certainly have is much more esteem as, one may hope, intelligent beings on the way to maturity. They are being taught, again one may hope, to think for themselves and to express their thoughts. They should be listened to — on their studies (curricula, standards, examinations, number and quality of lectures) and on their conditions of work. But they should not make the decisions. They just haven't time for that sort of government, nor have they the

maturity. In the fields of policy-making and administration they are still only students, and they need a long apprenticeship before they qualify as professors.

Is it right to opt out of a corrupt society?

It depends how far out your option takes you. You don't want to touch pitch and be defiled; but perhaps you could lay in a stock of turpentine or other stain-removers for the benefit of those who have dabbled in pitch. A merely selfish running away would not be Christian, nor would it ensure the safety of the fugitive. Selfishness, though it be cloistered, is still a corruption.

Opting out is not, in its Christian form, a mere rejection of society. It is, on the contrary, a strong assertion, in the very middle of society, of the truths which society must adopt if it is to keep its health. What do you do if your favourite theatre puts on an offensive display of nudity? You withhold your custom. If there are enough like-minded customers to bring box office receipts well down, the play is taken off. The producers and actors will talk of art for art's sake when they are justifying their exhibition, but money talks louder. A similar opting out will have its effect on films, books, sport, newspapers and their colour magazines, and advertisements.

The effect, it seems, is not big enough to sterilise the sources of corruption. The minority which is trying to give the impression that the mass of people in this country are in favour of abortion on demand, contraceptive advice for school-girls, orgies on the stage, and license in the name of liberty is getting its way. It is time the speechless majority opted out with a resounding condemnation. Most people are afraid of being a lone voice raised against the amplified chorus of those who have a firm grip on the microphones; but if they would first speak quietly to one another, and so discover what a volume of sound they could produce together, they would find courage to speak and would drown the vice of corruption.

It is a fact that coloured immigrants receive the worst of housing available. Is this fair?

I'll take your word for the fact. There is another fact to be taken into account: housing is in short supply. That means there is a queue waiting for houses to be made available for them. How do you propose that the queue be organised? If it were a bus queue, you could say: First come, first served. For purposes of public transport, that saying is the equivalent of "One man is as good as another" — and so he is in a bus queue. But in other queues, one man is not necessarily as good as another, and no amount of egalitarian theory will make him so.

When people apply for a job, the interviewer tries to find the person best suited for it. If he is forced to give the job to the next person in the queue, then he can't run his business efficiently and qualifications for jobs cease to matter. If he is compelled to accept a coloured applicant just because he is coloured, then he is robbed of reasonable freedom of choice, and all non-coloured applicants are discriminated against.

Are all tenants equally acceptable? Obviously not. Some can be trusted to pay their rent regularly and to keep up the value of the property. Others are likely to default in their payments and to let the property run down. The owner, whether a local authority or a private landlord, should be allowed to choose his tenant, whether white or coloured. That will lead to the making of predominantly coloured settlements in all cities. So what? We have always had the like — Italian, French, Catholic, Protestant quarters. They need not be "ghettoes" nor do they imply "apartheid". We don't help solve the colour problem by being over-sensitive to colour.

It used to be a punishable offence for a man to dress up as a woman. Recently in a respectable newspaper, there was a photograph of a man modelling a long-skirted dress designed for

men's evening wear. Does this show moral deterioration in our society?

Not necessarily. One of the chief purposes of clothing is to give the wearer the privacy and self-possession which human beings should have. That purpose can be and has been achieved with fashions varying in amplitude from the tent to the sausage-skin, and in length from the maxi to the mini — and that for both men and women. Skirts for men are not inherently wrong — the natural law does not prescribe trousers for them. Flowing robes are more becoming for men than trousers in many situations, especially in sacred ceremonies such as a coronation, or in the administration of the law, or in high academic functions. Some climates have forced the dwellers in it to adopt long clothes as insulation against heat and cold. Custom has also favoured long skirts for clerics and men religious: a certain external dignity was thought suitable for men specially dedicated to the following and imitation of Christ.

When skirt wearing is contrary to the general fashion it could be merely an attempt to make an abrupt change in fashion, and it can be left to fizzle out. It should not, without strong evidence, be taken as an example of sexual perversity. One should also remember the existence at any one time of a certain number of oddities. Some of them, like the bearded lady, find their way to the side-shows of circuses. Others impersonate the opposite sex on the stage and they may be supposed to be making an honest living in their own odd way. It is reasonable, even so, to be aware of the possibility of unhealthiness.

BOOK REVIEWS

Change and the Philistine's Queue

Our Changing Liturgy, by C. T. McNaspy, S.J.:
Doubleday Image Books. 95c.

My philanthropic friends who earnestly desire to convert me from my own radicalism to theirs continue to send me books like this one, for reasonably intelligent layfolk by advocates of what are now called "the reforms"; in which category my philanthropic friends still keep me. Perhaps it would be some slight kindness on my part were I to remind them that I am no enemy of "the reforms" and that in some respects I believe I may be regarded, after all, as somewhat ahead of the *avant garde*. For example, I recall that some twenty years ago, when I ventured to write about the priesthood of the laity, I was told that I was talking like a Protestant. Nowadays, if I dare say that a priest is rather more than "the president of the assembly", I am told I am talking like a baroque Papist.

I await a fruitful dialogue, if not with obdurates like the Rev. Ian Paisley, at least with Evangelicals like Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones. I want to see deacons in the Western Rite, if only that the Epistle and Lesson shall be read at Mass by a cleric. In given conditions e.g. a retreat Mass, I believe it proper for women to read the Lesson or the Epistle. It may be sometimes right for them to preach though they are much more effective than men in private talks. As far as I understand St. Paul's admonition, it seems to concern married women in Corinth who were chatter-boxes, who also liked to show off. And then my traditional folk-derived Syndicalism (in my language "*perchentyaeth*") makes me as bitter an enemy of capitalism as any *avante*

garde Catholic who flirts with Marxists. My native royalism, well expressed recently by the Orthodox Archbishop Anthony Bloom — “many men may rule others but only kings die for their people” — is, if some will bear the paradox, more democratic than what Dizzy called “the Republic of the Whigs”. (And neo-whiggism is what we often have to contend with these days.) I heard of direct action when the Tonypandy Riots were fresh in Rhondda minds and never needed to read Marcuse in order to see the point made by Sorel and *The Miners’ Next Step*.

Very well; and now comes *Our Changing Liturgy*, a book of the near-new sort (1967) which I am reviewing now in order to show how soon the “new” takes on a weary look. As in any other near-new book, *Tradition and Change in the Church*, I found almost at the beginning a sentence which tempted me to read no further. Fr. McNaspy is defending “change” and quotes with approval Chesterton’s words: “If you leave a thing alone, you leave it to a torrent of change; a white post soon becomes black”. But surely that is no help to a defence of “change”? Fr. McNaspy does not want to leave things alone. If he followed G.K.C. in this, he would have that white post kept white with a perennial bucket of whitewash. Chesterton’s *obiter dictum* is, of course, a defence of Conservatism.

I wish that Father McNaspy and Canon Mackey, author of *Tradition and Change in the Church*, had put their heads together concerning what Fr. McNaspy next writes of, the challenge of risks involved in change. Canon Mackey, when confronted with danger, draws back. For example, he asks the question, “Is it not true that traditions or cultures at this time are too national, too racial? Is it not the case that, although they cement a community at the national or racial level, indeed because they cement a community at this level, they divide communities from each other on the international level or the inter-racial level?” How I would like to answer those questions at length. The short answer to the first is “no”, and to the second it is, “certainly and rightly so”. But I take the risk. I take it because a living

society, the nation, is worth conserving (and *Mater et Magistra* tells me I am right). Meanwhile something ought to be said about the virtually unchallenged teaching that "change" (I keep the word in inverted brackets) is essential to any living and healthy society. For centuries, a classical Chinese civilisation rested upon a static philosophy of life. For the Chinese only barbarians blasphemed against their ancestors by behaving like adolescents. Certainly a healthy society should tackle threats to its necessary form, and to answer the challenge by a development proper to itself is right. I am no enemy of heroic change whereby constancy is preserved; indeed where the only way to preserve the form is to develop. I am a foe to mere turbulence and restlessness and agitation, where the rebel is right only at the moment of revolt. We are now engaged in the heroic task of preserving constancy throughout necessary change in order to achieve a sound development of the Church. But Father McNaspy is able to cite several theologians, including Charles Davis, who appear to speak against this. They call for adaptation by which they mean assimilation, as far as I can see. But adaptation to some changing environment may well mean not this, but armour against it. In this connection, a Welshman may recall that, when Lloyd George compared his career to the River Severn which followed the natural course of hill and valley from Wales into England, Saunders Lewis, the Catholic, in a great polemic answered; "but a man is not a river".

It seems to me most pertinent that we should study yet again Fr. McNaspy's interest in the way in which people (he cites Fr. Aelred Baker) "readily adapt archaic and repetitive formulae to even their most personal approaches". But what is this "archaic"? A word that retains a meaning, even if it has antiquity on its side, is only called archaic by journalists (*mea culpa*). Perhaps the most ancient of words in any language is formed by a babe which wants to give a name to its parent. The sound "mama" or "papa" is said to come naturally from a babe in any clime. But I am not surprised that Fr. McNaspy is here hesitant to

condemn "every symptom of Conservatism". He might have noticed Tennyson's conception of Conservatism: "the man's a true Conservative who lops the mouldered branch away".

Now Fr. McNaspy asks the question I ask; "Why the urgency about change today"? One answer may be that it is a false urgency or ill in motive, an urgency based upon some energeticist mood. I have already provided my apologia for my interest in "the reforms", with special reference to the rediscovery of the priestly role of the Church as a whole. And, after all, I am a Bible Christian, so that no ultra-reformer dare suggest that I am an obscurantist in respect of the preaching of the Word of God. I also have noticed what Fr. McNaspy calls "bizarre devotions" and the corruption of piety into superstition. No wonder that he gives a little praise to St. Pius V. But I suspect that, like so many others, Fr. McNaspy lines up in a Catholic Philistine's Queue (the reference is taken from a letter of Engels).

Fr. McNaspy and others argue that rubrics which were right in 1570 no longer serve our liturgical needs. For "change may well be the most characteristic trait of our time" (an observation somewhat outside a theologian's compass). He writes also of a population explosion (a journalistic cliché) and I write in a land where there is a decline in many counties and where the population as a whole has barely risen for decades. Fr. McNaspy wrote before the decisive encyclical on the transmission of life that dashed the hopes of some of the *avant garde*. So we are left with the less "exciting" (*inquit*) business of liturgical reform. It seems to him that "traditionalism" is out. It is "antiprogressive". I must answer that, if traditionalism be an exaggeration, then progressivism is one also. He attacks the traditionalist for having a short memory, for "canonising the immediate past without seeing it and the present in the larger perspective of the full tradition which is never static but ebbs and flows". But I am tolerably sure that Fr. McNaspy regards this age as one that shows the arrival of Man. It always seems, indeed, to me that the progressivist

canonises, if not the strict present, that future-present which is always awaiting the Dawn. It lies at the end of the Philistine's Queue. It ought to occur to them that, if they are right about change, then Vatican II may one day be superseded by a Council which may produce what they would call an "ebb".

To take an example near at home; the Catholic Church of old Britain when bishops went to Arles and Rimini was much more "advanced" than it was when Dewi came upon the scene. But the "advance of the Church in the decline of the Roman Empire was full of autumnal foreboding. In contrast, Dewi was a saint of a new Christian spring in which Dewi could call to "faith" that was not the thesis of a pagan or heretical antithesis. One thinks also of Scotus Erigena, a theologian-philosopher of those dark ages, who was thinking in a way that would have pleased modern Orthodox thinkers like Berdyaev.

I grieve a little to have to make these comments because, like so many books of its kind, this one is helpful even to recalcitrants like me. I think of those (again like me) who believe that the kerygmatic approach is now being overdone, at least within the strict liturgy. I believe it is being overdone in that it does not seem to be restricted to the Mass of the Catechumens. It invades the arcanum where the faithful have to worship rather than hearken to a heralded message. I would dearly like the kerygma in open air preaching; and I long believed that the Catholic Evidence Guild's didactic and controversial methods might long ago have been supplemented by gospel preaching even by layfolk — remembering that St. Francis and, at first, the founder of the Passionists, St. Paul of the Cross, were lay preachers. It may be added that, as some Orthodox thinkers have shown, what we think of as extra-liturgical is, after all, bound up in the liturgy.

I am sure that I have one advantage over the Author in his straining after the maximum of *ex opere operantis*. I am a birth-right Quaker (and, by the way, the Author is utterly wrong when he says that Quakers use silence as a

symbol; they use it as a basis for worship), and I used to attend (and sometimes still attend) Welsh chapel services where the *hwyl* of the kerygmatic pastor is almost a convention. Fr. McNaspy will not let a priest utter the Word of God in a dramatic manner. On his scheme of things I do not see why. Am I really more progressive than he is? If we are going to have *ex opere operantis* a l'outrance, let us also have the *hwyl*. It was used with great effect in Penybont ar Ogwr in 1949 by that ultra-conservative prelate, Archbishop McGrath, who, it was said, "turned himself into a Welshman". It is evident in the Eastern rites.

I have done no more than provide a slight shadow upon this new light which, ominously, sheds its rays upon what Fr. McNaspy calls "the new Mass". In close relation to that are his sentences upon liturgy and ecumenism, in which he dwells on what our oriental fellow Christians do. I cannot help noting that he wants Latins to copy them in this and that. But this will just not do. Perhaps he, like Canon Mackey, fears the clash of different cultures and proposes to solve the problem by a cultural eclecticism. But we must well understand that rites depend upon mood and history and culture. Are we to produce a composite theology in which equally licit expressions will be, so to speak, mashed together? Shall we read up Gregory Palamas and the apophatics and then develop in some manner a mixed apophatic and cataphatic theology? We must try to see that only in the Ethiopian rite is it meet that the deacon should cry out "Yeigh, yeigh yeigh". Let us pray lest our zeal for reform produces a popish lobsouse.

H. W. Edwards.

Quiet Englishman

British G.I. in Vietnam by Ian Kemp; Robert Hale, 35s.; pp. 220.

The English public, like the American, has been effectively brain-washed with regard to the war in Vietnam.

For as long as I can remember, TV and Press have represented it in a manner that has delighted Communist hearts. The theme of almost every press report I have read, every TV news report I have viewed has been deprecatory of the American effort in aid of South Vietnam to the point where American forces employed in support of that effort have become for the peoples of the world no more than brutal aggressors let loose on a peace-loving peasantry. The reporting has been savagely partial. The alleged massacre at My Lai, for example, has been dwelt on and embroidered to the point where many must now believe that brutality of the sort described is part of the everyday output of the American soldier at war. The issue of My Lai was prejudged before those alleged to be responsible for it were brought to trial and preliminary and essential inquiries set in train. By contrast, the appalling massacre of 2,000 South Vietnamese in cold blood by the Vietcong in and around Hue during the Tet offensive of February, 1968, has scarcely been dwelt on. If the wordage devoted to each in the world Press were compared, there would be no comparison between the two. My Lai would be way out in front by thousands and thousands of words. If headline space were measured, My Lai would have it by yards.

So one might go on, but this is not my purpose here. It is, rather, to draw the reader's attention to the gross partiality of the reporting on Vietnam in order that, by contrast, he may be drawn to read a book written by a young Englishman who saw the war at first-hand, for the very simple reason that he was fighting in it. Ian Kemp enlisted in the American army and volunteered for service in Vietnam. At the end of his first year of service, during which he saw desperate fighting, he volunteered for a second. He came away with the coveted Silver Star and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry. During his two years service in Vietnam, he received no less than twelve separate awards for valour. He fought in the Vietnamese war out of conviction and he writes of the fighting he saw with directness, simplicity and considerable humour. There is not one ounce of bombast in his book.

It is a soldier's narrative at its best; and there is, throughout, a soldier's respect for the American fighting men who were his brothers-in-arms and his friends.

It is important, even now, that this book should have the widest possible circulation. I learnt more from it of the American fighting man in Vietnam — indeed, of the close-range nature of the war in Vietnam — than from any other single source. Others, I think — except the hopelessly prejudiced — will find the same. As a result, one hopes, a balance, so hopelessly tipped against the Americans by deliberately prejudiced reporting, will be to some little extent redressed.

Paul Crane, S.J.

LIFE CAN BE BETTER

One of the great revolutionary forces at work in the world today is the universal prevalence of the idea that human life *can* be better, that hunger and premature death are not inevitable, that mankind is far more master of its fate than, in most societies for thousands of years, anybody had thought possible. The old contentment of habit is over; the cake of custom is broken. Amelioration of the human condition is known to be possible and is taken as a natural right. "The pursuit of happiness" is world-wide and urgent.

D. W. Brogan in *America in the Modern World*